

A 4152.2.75
FRIENDLY EPISTLE

TO THE
Reverend Clergy,

AND

Nonconforming Divines, who greatly approve of my late Epistle to Mr. *George Keith* against Plunging, and for Sprinkling in Baptism.

Wherein is proved,

- I. That the Proofs commonly brought for Plunging are precarious and frivolous; and that there are more Arguments against it then what I have yet named.
- II. That the Face or Head must be washt in Baptism without other Parts of the Body, not other parts of the Body without them.
- III. That it is more then probable, our Baptism is of God, Plunging not so, from the woful Stamp found on the Anabaptists first Reformers.

WITH

A Censure of an Epistle to Mr. *Keith*, against mine to him, by a nameless Man, (or Men) whose silence here brings another Thought to my Mind against Plunging. That it is made a plain, necessary Duty, tho' the Scripture be silent about any one Precept, or Example, or one good Consequence for it; and therefore Plunging being thus Nameless is Folly.

By *Trepidantium Malles* K

LO N D O N: Printed for *John Marshall*, at the Bible in Grace Church-street. 1700.

TO THE
HONOURABLE



WILLIAM



A Friendly Epistle to the Clergy and Dissenting Di- vines, &c.

I Thank you all, Great Sirs, For your fa-
vourable Acceptance of my late Labour
about the *Form of Baptism*; that it is not
plunging but pouring. Some are pleas'd to say,
They were asleep who thought not of my way of
proving this Truth. Others, That I have made
great Discoveries. That must convince the
the Learned Bapts, vulgarly Anabaptists, that I
have pluck'd up their wild Notions by the Roots,
&c.

You see, no learned pious Divines of theirs,
are willing to appear in Print, or an open
Disputation; which makes some conclude,
they think, as you say, My *Epistle to Mr. Keith*
unanswerable: And because some in Discourse
others by Letters, desire me to say more, and
not be diverted either about the Subject of
Baptism or other things. In compliance with

A

their

their Request, which with me hath the force of a Command, I shall endeavour to prove,

1. That the Arguments commonly urged for Plunging, are precarious, frivolous, and such as hardly deserve the Name of Arguments among thinking Men. And that there are more Proofs for Effusion, commonly call'd Sprinkling, then those I have already urged.

2. That the Face or Head only must be Baptized, no other parts, &c.

3. That our Cause must be of God, and theirs not so, from the true Account of the first Opposers of our Baptism, and the Introducers of Plunging. To begin,

1. That the Arguments commonly urged for Plunging, are precarious, frivolous and such as hardly deserve the name of Arguments, &c.

Before I engage here, I must premise two things.

1. That if some wise Men urged some of their Proofs, it was an antecedent Mistake on other considerations.

2. That I shall not meddle with those Objections which I have in other Books fully consider'd; or if I at any time do, I shall add to my former Answers.

1. Some urge the Example of our Lord, who, tho' he had no sin to wash away, yet dignified his own Ordinance. as a King will sometimes enter himself among such an Order of Men, to dignify the Stamp he hath put on them. Now, say they, *Matthew 3. 16.* Je-

sus, when he was Baptized, *went streight way*
out of the water, &c. Here I shall say what
 hath been said by worthy Divines, and add
 my own: Waters lie low as in Valleys, and
 so did that River *Jordan*; there being a de-
 scent to go to, and an ascent to come from.
 A Man may be said to go down to the Water,
 and come up from it, if he walks only by it:
 and touched it not with his Finger. Say,
 they it is *αὐτὸ* not *ἐν τῷ ὑδάτι*. All this is
 clear to any good *Grecian*. But I add, were
 it *ἐν* not *αὐτὸ*, our Cause suffer'd not a jot,
 unless any be such grand Fools as to say, No
 man came out of (in the strictest sense) the Wa-
 ter unless plunged there. Did no man that e-
 ver was wash'd, or thrown not to the waist
 in the Water, come out of it as well as from
 it?

I ask soberly (Lord keep me serious here)
 was the blessed Son of God, the Example of all
 Excellencies, and therefore of Modesty, and
 Gravity. (My Hand quivers in the writing it)
 I say, was he baptized in *puris naturalibus*?
 If any say, why not baptised so as well as cru-
 cified so? One is of choice, the other not so.
 If you go naked when you may have Cloaths
 you sin? If you must go so turn'd out of doors,
 and your Cloaths taken from you, this is not
 your fault, tho infelicity, but the fault of
 them that thus dealt with you. For Cloaths
 on, know all men, Christ made no more Bap-
 tism for Cloaths, then for Bells, and such

things which Popish Priests solemnly Baptize.

Pardon, O Jesus, their Blasphemies, that think so unworthy of thee: Pardon me, that in a Defence of thy Ordinance and Modesty. I have thus presumed — I am as sure: That thou, all whose Yokes are easie, and burdens light, most decently wast, Water being poured on thy Head and blessed Face, as if I saw thee so. Did not John go into the Water, come from it, or out of it (strain the words you Dippers as much as you will) as well as Christ? was John plunged with him? Bp. Usher says, Christ was crucified quite naked; and the Painter lyes that Covers the *puerenda*.

2. Others, urge, John baptized in Emon, because there was much Water, and now they triumph with an *εὐρυμα εὐρυμα* as he at his Mathematical Discovery: No Man can Answer it, say they. 3. John 23. To add to what I have already said, for no man hates repetitions of this nature more than I.

They that come to be baptized from all parts, must then come for a conveniency of Water, especially to one that preached in a Wilderness, and such places: Not in Edifices erected for that purpose, as we all, and the Bapts themselves do now.

2. Let any Syllogism be made; see whether it be true, or will conclude well about this.

He that comes to a Place to be Baptized, where is much Water, must be plunged there if because there is much water, but is this true? The Israelites in the Wilderness were glad where

where they met with much Water to drink in (not evacuate there.) As Men eat and drink more than Children, yet Children as really eat and drink as men, so they might be baptized with more Water than they, and yet they as truly said to be baptized as men.

3. They urge again, the Example of the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 38. *Philip* and he went down into the Water, and he baptized him. Remember my Dippers, that baptizing cannot be meant plunging here, or by going down into the water, cannot be meant so, for else the sense (or if you will, the nonsense) must run thus.

And Philip plunged the Eunuch in the water, and himself too, and when he had so done, he plunged the Eunuch. Pray Gentlemen, desire your Leaders, who thus paraphrase like mad men, to give us in print some more of their Comments. They might be of use in cold Winter Nights. No Friends, I say the Text proves not plunging but pouring. *Baptizo*, I say, never signifies to plunge, let some Lexicon makers say what they will. He went soon to his Charret, and therefore I averr, was baptized not in your way. He went not to strong Liquors, a good Fire or warm Bed. None come to him; *How is it Brother*, after it? No rubbing or pulling of the Nose (as with Women) for fear. The Eunuch was not such a Fool to be *bapted* (or plunged) when to be *baptized* (or washt) we often say, *come nigh me, David wash you*, when we only throw water and wash our heads only. *A 3* only.

only on the Face; I will now take this opportunity of speaking my mind more freely. I am not so sure that *baptizo* (Catechrestically, or any other way) is once used to plunge, as I am sure that *bapto* is once used to pour or sprinkle, *Dan. 4. 23.*

It is said of *Nebuchadnezzar*, That his Head or body was wet with the Dew of Heaven. Now how is this exprest $\chi\iota\sigma\alpha\mu\alpha\epsilon\beta\alpha\phi\eta$. Now Mr. Dippers, shew us so plain a Place where *Baptizo* is used to plunge once, as this where *bapto* is used only to wet by the Seventy.

It is well known the Jews call'd their washing of dead Corps $\beta\alpha\psi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\acute{\omega}\nu$. A baptizing the dead. It is as certain this Baptism was not plunging, but applying the water, not to every little part, but the main of the body; it is then as certain, that *baptizo* signifies not to plunge but pour. Whether *Paul* alludes to this custom, when he says, *why are we then baptized for dead?* I know not, after long thoughts, of the sense of that place; I conclude nothing about it. Whether this sense, or because some baptized in Church-yards, to shew they believed the Resurrection, or baptized as dead; stoned as *Paul* was, and left as dead, &c. This baptizing of the dead, *Acts 9. 37.* is exprest $\Delta\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$ washing. I add to what I have elsewhere said, on *Roman 6. 4.* Buried with him (in Baptism) is a metaphorical Expression, and may be used out of sacramental thing. Sometimes we are said to be washed in Christ's Blood, who hath loved us, and washed

washed as in his own blood so sprinkled: 12. Heb.

24. One once, with great Confidence, said, taking up a nasty Glass, should you bid a Boy wash this Glass, and he only throw a few drops on it, and sprinkle it, what would you say? I replied, what if he only put the Glass once into the water, and took it presently out again, what would you say? Is that washing? But I say again, what if this Glass were thus put in all covered with Linnen or Woolen? neither would be well washed: Why Sirs, rubbing and scouring is necessary for washing, strictly taken. Hath Brother a mind to rub Sisters Face to make it clean (need enough perhaps sometimes) Sisters back too — to name no more. If any go in the water to wash their Feet, will a turn in and out do without staying or rubbing; stay you till this washt, you would never come out alive again.

I come now also to prove, That there are more Arguments to prove Plunging unlawful in Baptism, then what I have urged; that I have proved *John and Peter declared they plunged no man, &c.* is granted by the wisest that have seen the Book. I go on,

Is it not highly probable, if not certain, *Peter* call'd for water when he baptized, *Acts 10. 47.*

Who can forbid water (a common phrase) for who can deny to bring out send out) that these should be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. But I hope *Peter* did not call for a River. Enough this might

might more then forbid. If any bring Water it is not for such plunging but lesser uses.

2. The Apostles command and practice is to shun the appearance of evil. Plunging hath the appearance of it: tho they now baptize (as they call it) not naked as some of their Fathers.

3. We are sometimes said to be washt with the Blood of Christ, sometimes sprinkled with it, *Leviticus* 16. 14. Sprinkling was a Jewish washing.

The 36 of *Ezekiel* 25. refers to Gospel times, and why not Gospel Baptism?

Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean. If sprinkling doth make them clean, then is there no necessity of plunging.

4. *Acts* 16. 23. The Jaylor and all his were baptized straightway. In a Prison. By Night. God's Ordinances are calculated for all Meridians. How far may some go in the Eastern Countries before they can find a place to plunge in? So in *Spain* and other places? What shall they do in very cold Climates? If Baptisme were plunging not pouring? we may say to such Plungers as the Council of *Jerusalem* to their Dictators. Why tempt you God to put a Yoke on the Neck of the Disciples which cannot be born. Nigh *Richmond* in *Yorkshire*, when *Paulinus*, as *V. Bede* says (a delightful Book worth Gold) baptized about ten thousand in a day, did he plunge them? Dr. *Fuller*, as others have observed as well as I, makes excellent Observations on the Story against the Papists Enemies

Enemies on the right hand, that here was no *Crossing, Salt*, and other Fopperies of theirs; and against the Anabaptist Adversaries on the left hand, where was the embracing, and Plunging Head and Ears? &c.

This Historian writes more poetically than some others do, and makes curious Observations as he goes along.

As for the Ancients, I trouble not my self much about them. Enquirers contend. Mr. *Watts* hath excelled in proving *Atanasius, Cyprian*, and others, used Aspersions as a lawful Baptism; for *Tertulian* I have in another Book, considered the Anabaptists Vaporing: he desir'd Baptism might be deferr'd 'till they could profess their Faith, &c.

1. He was a Montanist when he thus did. A woful Corrupt man, if not a *Heresick*, the worst of the Fathers, if he deserves the Name of a Father.

2. This shews Infant Baptism was then practised, else no need to speak against it; were they before *Popes that brought it in?* as some Bapts now say.

Some Men and Women now look like Death when dipt, tremble, &c. It was a pleasure in hot Countreys to go in the Water if they had conveniency, if to wash their Feet: Not so generally to us; how soon were their Sandals put off and on?

3. I now come to prove, That the Head or Face must be washt without other Parts of the

the Body, not other parts without them in holy Baptism.

Some Plungers say what must you sprinkle (and here talk rudely, tho' others soberly) The Brest, the Arms, or the Legs? no, for under the Law the Anointing were on the Head principally, &c.

2. All things must be done decently. Now I would appeal to others, whether a plain, simple Gospel, (not legal) Sacrament, or so honourable an Ordinance as Baptisme could be decently administred openly and all the World over, but on the Face? For

3. All things must be done safely. No Child dies that we hear of this way, tho' some by plunging. You Bapts, will you here put wonder against wonder.

4. The Faces of all are open, or but slightly cover'd, therefore the more fit for Baptism.

5. By the Face are we known. God's Image is there most seen; under it the Soul principally dwells, and exerciseth its Faculties and Functions. In the fore-part of the Head is the Fancy; in the middle the Understanding; in the hinder part, the Memory, and therefore we bow the Head when we call any thing to remembrance; there are all the Senses, *Sight, Hearing, Smelling, Tasting, and Feelling too.*

If God must have the best in other Things, then here. The Face is the most glorious part of the man, and differs in excellency above other Parts as that glorious Canopy the blessed God hath hung over our Heads; Sun,
Moon,

Moon, Stars, differ from this massy Earth, and Trees, Stones, and other things here: Therefore the *Greeks* call a person and a Face by one and the same Greek Word *ἄνθρωπος*. If any look on this wherein I speak my own Thoughts, a flight of Fancy, let it be so, but I am sure it is a flight of Judgment too.

Yes, says Mr. *Minge* and other Brothers, what is all this to Infants, they understand nothing? They have *Eyes* and *see not*, *Ears* and *hear not*. Stop, Sirs. They that makes them so are like unto them.

1. This is not my question now.

2. They understand as much as the Jewish Children did when circumcised. Did they know it was a Seal of God's Covenant? No: No more then some Dolts or Bapts now do; or that it signified circumcising the Heart? No, no more then some Old Infants among us, who say, It is only a Sign they should have the Land of *Canaan*.

If Plunging were a Duty, it would be hard to prove Infant Baptism so; by the same Back-door Plunging came in, Infant-Baptism went out. Lock, say I, the outward Door against Plunging well, for if that Thief get in, you are robb'd of more. As for those superstitious times when they had their *Baptistaria*. They had their *Trina immersio*. Dipping three times to signify,

1. The

1. The Trinity.

2. Christ's being three Days and three Night in the Grave.

3. Three sorts of sins, say some, to be mortified, sinful Thoughts, Words, Actions. You Bapts, do you not loath such weakness, who dip but once? And in good Earnest; that is once too much.

1. They baptized men and Women apart, not mixt.

2. They did it not in the view of every rude Man or Boy that should pass by and mock. Only from high Windows oft-times, some might so. Consider this, you rude Dippers. They were much less immodest then you.

What the Apostle said in another Case, I say, *Beware lest Satan tempt you through your incontinency.*

Cry superstitious Bapt as *Peter* in a fit of intemperate Zeal, Head, Hands, and all Cry in the other Sacrament, *A Loaf of Bread*, not a Bitt. *A whole large cup of Wine*, Not a few Sips: Run Bapt, Run down to the bottom of the Cup, Drink up all, and mistake that Scripture here, as well as others, *Eat, drink abundantly*, O Beloved, Drink thus till you be as giddy, as mazy-headed as you were when dipt, and hardly understand any more. *This do in remembrance of me.* Then you did; I baptize thee, &c. Open such a Mouth as if a Man might put in a little Loaf, or such as you open when you declaim against

eat &c.

true

true Baptism. Your Heads were weak and giddy enough before, you needed not plunging, nor any thing else to make them weaker.

Now comes a knocking Argument against Pouring. If the Face or Head of the Eunuch had only been washt, it was but to send a Bason, and it had quickly been done. Thou Fool, says *Paul* in another case, where have Men Basons in Coaches? Had *Philip* and he had occasion but to drink, they must have gone down. Where should they have had a Cup? Nature must have supplied the place of Art. The Palms of their hands had been their Cups. How merry have I seen some with this foolish Argument?

Reader I hope thou hast not lost thy Patience, I profess I have almost lost mine, to answer such Trifles.

3. Now I come to prove our Cause to be of God, the Bapts not so, by the Reformers that condemned true Baptism, and brought in plunging.

John of Leyden (alias *Boecold* a Taylor) burnt the Churches, drove out the Magistrates in *Munster*, about one hundred and sixty years since. Had his twelve Apostles, amongst the rest *St. Matthias* a Baker, these were for a community of Goods, and a Community of Wives. He that brought not all in must die. There is no end of enumerating their Blasphemies, especially in their Book call'd *Resurrection*, which their twelve Apostles were to pro-

B

pagate

pagate throughout the World. *John of Leyden*, King of *Jerusalem*, or *Sion*, after he had given the Sacrament, in the open Market, imbrued his Hands in the Blood of one of his Wives, for saying, *she thought the Cause not of God, that they should fare sumptuously, and poor People want Bread.* But their Reign was but short. They were routed. The King tyed fast, followed with burning Pincers to tear his Flesh; he bore the first or second snip without any noise, but after cried for Mercy.

St. Matthias stood it out to the last, till both were run through with a Sword. *David George* would go up and down and say, any Opposition of him and his Doctrine, should be as the unpardonable Sin. This made poor People tremble and comply with them. But no end is there of these things. These Reader, these were the Anabaptists first Reformers of Protestant Churches. Now judge from whom brought they their new Cause, from God or the Devil? These opposed the best Ministers, and Christians in the World:

Obj. Was not *John* a Reformer? Yes, but

1. He was a sober Man, these as Devils.
2. He rooted out *Baal's* Idolatry; here were reformed Churches.

Yet *Danvers* question'd this. Then *Luther*, *Zwinglius*, and all that affirmed it were Lyars; but this is like his Citation of Criticks, and Ecclesiastical Writers. He said the *Waldenses* were against Infant baptism, when in their excellent

ent Catechism mention'd by *Perin*; they have these Words.

For this Cause we baptize infants.

I know some famous Divines have said, That Governors should restrain this Evil practice of Plunging. That Kings should not suffer any open evil Practice to be tolerated to shorten the Lives of their Subjects. But I could rather wish Argument might convince the Plungers, then force restrain them.

Since the Earth was made, did ever God send such Devils like Men, to be Reformers of the best Men and Churches. Beware of false Prophets, such who were not inwardly only, but outwardly too, Ravening Wolves; by their Fruits shall you know them (if of Doctrine onely, is it not sometimes *idem per idem*) but practice.

I beseech you, you Dippers, Consider, they were not Grapes you gather'd of these Thorns, nor Figs of these Thistles; these corrupt Trees brought forth this evil Fruit plunging, a false thing with a false Name also. Whereas I hear some plead against what I have said, That the Bapts evacuate in the Water of Baptism. Infants do so, say they. What! who have no baptismal Water but on the Face: To say nothing of the difference of the Subjects.

Whereas *D. Russel* in his pretended Confutation of *Mr. Chandler's Account of the Portsmouth Disputation*, mentioneth my Words. That to plead a cold Climate, is a cold Excuse. I meant only it were so: If they of old plung

ed as a Symbol of Christ's and our burial; not if only practis'd by them as their custom, to be so for their own refreshment in those hot Countries sometimes.

A Censure of a late Epistle to Mr. Keith against mine; some think under a Cover from my Brother S. and Brother C. the Scatterers of them.

Were it not for my fore-going work, I would not take notice of this Trifle, where are,

1. Many Objections anticipated, and replied to in my Epistle, and no notice taken of that Reply in *theirs*, there is no end of being particular here. The Book swells with them.

2. No pretended Answer to my Second and third Proposition in my Epistle. That Plunging is contrary to the Doctrine of Baptism, &c. That the Anabaptists plunge not. What are these two given me? How else can this be call'd an Answer? so that I think their Epistle was answered before it was written.

The Wife of Jeroboam, who made all *Israel* to sin, as our Plungers would, came in a

a Disguise to the Prophet, but he soon discover'd the Cheat. *Mr. Nameless* says, p. 6.

1. That I am mistaken in citing *Mark*. 7. for *Mark* 7. 4. and 9 *Heb.* 10. for 9 *Heb.* 11. &c. And here a Hue-and-Cry is sent after me: Oh unheard of Folly! no wonder some laugh (*Mr. Keith*) at his *βαπτισμὸν τὰς χεῖρας*, *Luke* 11. 38. by a *Grecism*.

It is well known such Accusative Cases after Verbs passive, are said by good *Grecians* (and that in their Grammars) as well as by *Latins*, to be by a Synecdoche. Washing Hands was not so much by immersion among the *Jews*, nor is now among us, not only if we wash under Cocks, and the like, but out of Basins themselves: Men commonly take up Water with one hand and poure it on another. But he takes no notice of a Place I cited 2 *Kings* 3. 11. of pouring Water on the Hands of *Elisha*. Now tho sometimes such Synecdoches be used, where the Sense is plain and obvious, yet to take boundless liberty here is intolerable. The Pharisee wondred Christ was not *plunged* or immersed; that is to say, about the Hands. This is a Bapts Comment: Who said, leaving out *ἐν* by *Luke*, alter'd the Sense in *Matthew*. No, I the more proved the Sense by it. *With* Water, not *into*, p. 9. he says the Fire appear'd only in the form of Tongues, yet say I, they were said to be baptized with Fire then, as with Water before. What need more be said? He hath given me my Cause.

I have somewhat else to do with my Time, and Money then to throw both away upon

him and his Brother *Minge*. Which is the greatest Impertinent, I know not. A Company of *John Bunnyans*. What an empty thing is his *Pilgrims Progress*, fit for Children, not Men. So his *Life*. Read his Faith about drying up of Water. His Saying in speaking of things, I am *Confident* commonly ; what is his *Comment* on *Gen.* but a Collection out of *Babington, Willet*, and such Books, yet this Ordinary (tho honest) Man, is accounted our great Divines Equal.

He says, p. 30. of *his Gentleman* (Mr. T. It had been a Scandal to him to be commended by me. What ? that since the Year 93. (About the time I suppose he began to be a Plunger) he tempted not only theirs but our Women to Uncleanness, and went to a Common-Whores House too, which the Bapts themselves prov'd on him six Months since (why not sooner by the Way) and disown him.

Doth Mr. Nameless intend to give another Proof, that Plunging is a breach of the Seventh Commandment : I thank him for what he says of me, pag. 4. 56. 30, 31. The same is said of Mr. *Alsop*, in *Socks* and *Buskins*.

Mr. *Minge* said the quite contrary, with nauseous Hyperbolies. Bnt a Bapts Commendations, or Censures, are much the same with me. He makes it beneath Brother *Collins*, or Brother *Stennet* to cope with me. The Quaker *Long* said, *The Snake in the Grass* was not worth Answering.

I would not be mistaken, when I speak of *Learned Bapts*, I mean only *Schollars* in opposition to *Trades-men*. Rarely doth any one of them write like ours of *Casuistical*, or *Practical Divinity*. What *Schollars* they are, I too well know. If they be the *Goliabs* of your Camp, my Stone taken out of my Bagg, without the Armour of Friends or Books, hath done the Work.

3. That in the second of the *Acts*, there was a plentiful Effusion of the Spirit to an immersion.

1. Then there was Effusion, which I plead for, and therefore not plunging. *Magis, & minus non variat specim.* is a known Rule; well, what was there a pouring out to Plunging?

Prove the Wind searched every part of the Body, as you say the Water must. I deny it, the most mighty rushing wind that we were in, never did. But was there a plentiful Effusion of Fire too? No, That lighted on them, but you Dipping Blockheads, was this Dipping? for that is the Question.

Now say I, *John* Baptized with Water, *Christ* with Fire, and both by pouring not plunging. Had you such a plentiful Effusion of Water on you to immersion or exunindation, as you phrase it, you might be so buried in Baptism, as to die under it too. If you direct us to such Effusions, God doth not.

4. That *Mat. 3. 3.* Not every individual Person in *Jerusalem*, *Judea*, and the Regions round about were baptized. And here I am told

told to distinguish between *singula generum*, and *genera singulorum*. And abundance of pains is taken to prove this choice discovery. In short, who so ignorant as not to know this! or to say the contrary.

5. That *John* had Substitutes. No, ver. 6. They were baptized of him. Else it had been explain'd as of Christ his baptizing. *Peter* had helps said he. Very unlikely any more then in Preaching. If he had, there was too great work for them all to make them Plungers of three thousand Souls. What a clutter doth Brother Bapts make to dip but a few? Men generally love to be baptized by the Man that converted them, if unbaptized before. And that it was done immediately on their Conversion; the History intimates, *Peter* bids them repent and be baptized; they were present Duties, and no doubt presently done.

6. That Derivatives in $\zeta\omega$ lose not the force of their Primitives.

1. He gives not one Example.

2. Bids me read *Scapula* and others, where he says I shall find many Instances.

1. Had I been put to read over two thousand Pages, it might have been a tolerable Task.

2. Who directs to Lexicons, to find words by their Characteristical Letter?

Reader, didst thou ever read such a piece of Impudence, Folly, and Madness?

3. I grant if the *Primitive* become obsolete, it is not so, but $\beta\alpha\tau\omega$ is not an obsolete word but still in use.

7. That

7. That among others, Pope *Gregory*, Pope *Leo*, and the Council of *Trent* declar'd for immersion as the ancient way, and these are commended for being Orthodox here. Blessed Company! Are these *Roman Catholicks* too in disguise? we know the time when too many of the dipping Brotherhood were so. My Query is what *John* says: I am told what such a Pope said, &c. Tho' I entred a Caution against this way of arguing in my Epistle. My Soul abhors with the greatest detestation imaginable, Bapts Citations of Criticks and Histories. For false Citations, they will put down any Seminary Priest. *Danvers* and *Russel* may cure any this way. For shame name no more the *Magdeburgensian* History as you do. You know who play'd the Divil with it.

He says I had been condemned with *Eusebius*, for denying immersion once, as he was for denying it thrice. Why had not the Bapts been condemned with me? They disown the Trine immersion. Dip but once.

He takes no notice of my naming the *Dutch* Anabaptists, to ballance the Pedobaptist here, who own immersion as the old way. My Epistle to Mr. *Keith* is gotten among them, and I believe it pleaseth them well, they hating plunging, and pleading for Effusion as I do.

Defame as much as you will, call me worse than you do, as bad as the mad *German* Anabaptist did *Luther*, or *Musculus*, I care not. All know your Cause is gone, and you cry after me as *Micah* after others; you have taken my Gods, and what have I more? I am not sad nor heavy.

heavy O please God) for all your false
or any thing to blacken me or my quarter
House. At such a rate you doth this Plana-
tion go on. Paragraph. That he Censures my Re-
mark about *Bartholomaeus Adark* 7. 4. and that
Mistake who took it for a Pasture, and all in
favour of his Cause not ours. if after all I
have said, you think otherwise, buy a Greek
Grammar. Away to School once more, where
Nobles in that Tongue may hiss at you, or
wile. Are you fit to play the Tutor with
Mr. Kels, and make him as your Pupil. By
telling his wife a Man what he should do.

Reader, if I have not now convinced thee
of this Mistake, or mistake, inability to Answer, I
must despair of convincing thee of any thing. I
have desired a meeting before Mr. Collins, Mr.
Searns and others, to answer to the Charge
gainst me, but all in vain. I lay with the Post.

Conscia mens recti ridet mendacia fana
I am ready to prove at an open Disputation
what they please.

1. *That the Baptist and Peter declare they plunged
not, but baptized with Water as Christ with Fire.*
2. *That plunging is no Lawful Baptism.*
3. *That the Anabaptist plunge not.*
4. *That Plunging (so call'd) and whoring came
together by the Anabaptists first Reformers of
the Protestant Churches, &c.*
5. *That the Fountains of Nations are often used
in their Baptisms, and many lose their Senses there-
fore unlawful by the light of Nature.*
6. *That the Word Baptizo never signifies to
plunge in all the New Testament.*

Y. COFFIN IS.

